



ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314
USA(703) 413-3000
(703) 413-2220 FACSIMILE

OBLONPAT@OBLON.COM

PATENT, TRADEMARK AND COPYRIGHT LAW
AND RELATED FEDERAL AND ITC LITIGATION

WWW.OBLON.COM

FACSIMILE

PLEASE CALL US AT (703) 413-3000 IF THE MESSAGE YOU RECEIVE IS INCOMPLETE OR NOT LEGIBLE

TO	NAME	Examiner Amizay	DATE	March 30, 2004
	COMPANY/FIRM	USPTO	FAX #	703-746-3491
	NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:	2	CONFIRM FAX:	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
FROM	NAME	Choongsoo Park	OUR REFERENCE	214935US 2 PCT
	DIRECT PHONE #	703-412-4533	YOUR REFERENCE	09/926,335

MESSAGE

Unless otherwise indicated or obvious from the nature of the transmittal, the information contained in this facsimile message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error or are not sure whether it is privileged, please immediately notify us by telephone and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service at our Expense. Thank You.

To: Examiner Amizay (Fax: 703-746-3491)
From: Choongsoo Park (Tel: 703-412-4533)
Date: March 30, 2004
Re: Application no. 09/926,335 (Our reference number: 214935US2PCT)

We would like to discuss the following issues during the interview.

- 1) As to the rejection of claims 1 and 11 under § 102(a), we believe that the Ogino reference does not disclose all the claim limitations. In particular, we believe that the Ogino reference does not disclose "synthesizing signals . . . with a phase difference in each multipath being maintained," as recited in claims 1 and 11. We would like to explain our reasoning and also would like to discuss possible claim amendments.
- 2) As to the rejection of claims 7 and 12 under § 103(a), we believe that the Ogino reference does not teach or suggest all the claim limitations. In particular, we believe that the Ogino reference does not teach or suggest "auto-correlation detector" recited in claims 7 and 12. We would like to explain our reasoning and also would like to discuss possible claim amendments.